



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/444,774	11/22/1999	MICHAEL G MIKURAK	10761.0194-00	9073
81331	7590	02/25/2011		
Accenture/Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP 901 New York Avenue Washington, DC 20001-4413				
EXAMINER				
DURAN, ARTHUR D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3622				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/25/2011		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

betty.finley@finnegan.com  
dianna.williams@finnegan.com  
catherine.vanhouten@finnegan.com

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
2  
3

---

4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
5 AND INTERFERENCES  
6

---

7  
8 *Ex parte* MICHAEL G. MIKURAK  
9

---

10 Appeal 2010-000340  
11 Application 09/444,774  
12 Technology Center 3600  
13  
14

---

15  
16 Before ANTON W. FETTING, JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI, and  
17 BIBHU R. MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.  
18 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

19 DECISION ON APPEAL<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, or for filing a request for rehearing, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 41.52, begins to run from the “MAIL DATE” (paper delivery mode) or the “NOTIFICATION DATE” (electronic delivery mode) shown on the PTOL-90A cover letter attached to this decision.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE<sup>2</sup>

Michael G. Mikurak (Appellant) seeks review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) of a final rejection of claims 70, 74-76, 82-87, 90-93, 99-104, 107-109, and 112-115, the only claims pending in the application on appeal. We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

The Appellant invented software for interacting with a user to increase visibility during installation management in an e-commerce environment. Specification 1: Field of the Invention.

An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claim 70, which is reproduced below [bracketed matter and some paragraphing added].

70. A method for a framework manager to provide installation management of a service in a network-based supply chain framework between at least two independent business entity users such as service providers, vendors, resellers, manufacturers and the like, the method comprising:

[1] causing a framework manager using a network to:

(a) receive information via the network

---

<sup>2</sup> Our decision will make reference to the Appellant's Appeal Brief ("App. Br.," filed May 18, 2009) and Reply Brief ("Reply Br.," filed September 8, 2009), and the Examiner's Answer ("Ans.," mailed July 8, 2009).

1 including information relating to a service  
2 provided by a service provider from the service  
3 provider;  
4 (b) receive information via the network  
5 including information relating to manufacturer  
6 offerings by a manufacturer from the  
7 manufacturer;  
8 (c) use and evaluate the information provided by  
9 the service provider via the network and  
10 the manufacturer  
11 to match  
12 the service to  
13 the offerings,  
14 evaluating factors that include  
15 cost and service provider requirements,  
16 speed of time to site integration,  
17 speed of acquisition,  
18 duplication reduction,  
19 procurement rationalization,  
20 transportation rationalization, and  
21 reduced inventories; and  
22 (d) use the service and manufacturer offerings  
23 information  
24 to manage installations  
25 through the use of a collaborative planning tool  
26 which facilitates the transfer of  
27 the information received from the  
28 service provider and  
29 the information received from the  
30 manufacturer;

1 [2] wherein the framework manager provides installation  
2 management  
3 between the manufacturer and the service provider  
4 by facilitating the selection and installation of the service  
5 for both matched business entity users.

6 The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

Gerace	US 5,991,735	Nov. 23, 1999
Webber, Jr.	US 6,167,378	Dec. 26, 2000
Whipple	US 6,289,385 B1	Sep. 11, 2001
Abgrall	US 6,373,498 B1	Apr. 16, 2002

7 Claims 70, 73-81, 87, 90-98, 104, and 107-111 stand rejected under 35  
8 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Webber and Whipple.

9 Claims 82-84, 86, 99-101, 103, and 112-115 stand rejected under 35  
10 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Webber, Whipple, and Abgrall.

11 Claims 85 and 102 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as  
12 unpatentable over Webber, Whipple, Abgrall, and Gerace.

13

14 ISSUES

15 The issues of obviousness turn on whether the art describes matching a  
16 product to a service as recited in limitation [1](c).

17 FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES

18 The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be  
19 supported by a preponderance of the evidence.



CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The rejection of claims 70, 73-81, 87, 90-98, 104, and 107-111 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Webber and Whipple is improper.

The rejection of claims 82-84, 86, 99-101, 103, and 112-115 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Webber, Whipple, and Abgrall is improper.

The rejection of claims 85 and 102 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Webber, Whipple, Abgrall, and Gerace is improper.

DECISION

To summarize, our decision is as follows.

- The rejection of claims 70, 73-81, 87, 90-98, 104, and 107-111 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Webber and Whipple is not sustained.
- The rejection of claims 82-84, 86, 99-101, 103, and 112-115 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Webber, Whipple, and Abgrall is not sustained.
- The rejection of claims 85 and 102 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Webber, Whipple, Abgrall, and Gerace is not sustained.

REVERSED

1

2

3    mev

4

5    Address

6    Accenture/Finnegan, Henderson,  
7    Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP  
8    901 New York Avenue  
9    Washington DC 20001-4413